DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 656 SO 010 459

AUTHOR Hall, Robert L.; Rosenthal, Saul
TITLE Education and Antagonism to Protest.
PUB DATE 8 Sep 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Chicago, Illinois, September 5-9, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Activism; *Attitudes; Class Attitudes; Conflict Resolution; *Correlation; *Educational Background; Literature Reviews; Measurement; National Surveys; Parent Education; Political Socialization; *Social Science Research; Sociology; *Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data); Trend Analysis; Violence

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzes the correlation between educational attainment and attitudes toward collective violence and protest. Data were taken from national attitude surveys in 1969 and 1970 and from numerous studies related to public opinion of violence and protest which followed student and civil rights demonstrations of the 1960s. Research has generally concluded that less educated people object more to activism and protest than do highly educated people. The present study investigated six hypotheses related to the major thesis that negative attitudes toward protest are highly correlated with low educational attainment. Measurement instruments were developed to test variables related to these hypotheses, such as occupational level and prestige, family income, political participation, age, place of residence, and social mobility. Findings corroborated earlier research by indicating a general trend toward higher antagonism toward activism at lower levels of educational attainment. However, this trend may simply reflect the fact that the causes of protest during the 1960s were causes supported primarily by educated people. The conclusion is that it is not possible to statistically verify the correlation between educational attainment and attitude toward collective violence and protest without further research. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148656

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert L. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EDUCATION AND ANTAGONISM TO PROTEST

Robert L. Hall
University of Illinois
at Chicago Circle

Saul Rosenthal
Creighton University

SO 010 459

August, 1977

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of The American Sociological Association, September 8, 1977.

EDUCATION AND ANTAGONISM TO PROTEST*

In the United States in the 1960's, protest among blacks and students, sometimes including violence, attracted much public attention and led to much research on public opinion about collective violence and protest. In that research, educational attainment was generally the strongest single correlate of antagonism toward collective violence and protest, with the more educated persons consistently less antagonistic. Two studies based on national sample surveys (Robinson, 1970; Spaeth, 1969) and several surveys on local samples (Olsen, 1968; Olsen and Baden, 1974; Ransford, 1972) found such a correlation, and it survived controls for a variety of related variables.

The present paper asks why education and antagonism to protest have been so consistently correlated. More specifically, several questions are raised and evidence examined. Does this observed correlation reflect an issue-free attitude toward collective violence and protest in general or an issue-bound attitude toward two particular sets of protest issues (racial equality, the Viet Nam conflict)? If it is issue-free, what links education and the attitude to protest? Are they linked by an extraneous variable (such as age, or place of residence), or is there a causal link from education to tolerance for protest? If it is a causal link, what intervenes in the causal chain?

For each hypothesized explanation of the correlation, evidence from past studies is examined, and each is tested, where possible, by secondary analysis of two national surveys. Some possible extraneous variables are

considered first. Issue-free explanations are considered next, and they are the main focus of the paper, as they have been the only explanations offered in the published literature. Then some bits of evidence are examined concerning issue-bound interpretations.

Six hypothesized issue-free mechanisms, taken mostly from previous research, are tested here by controlling for hypothesized intervening or extraneous variables. Briefly, the six issue-free hypotheses, to be treated more fully later, are:

H1. Class-based socialization. Educational attainment and attitude toward protest are results of a common cause: social class differences in socialization. Hence their correlation is spurious and not evidence of a causal link.

H2. Conflict over earned privilege. Education increases privilege (as shown in income and occupational level), and the less privileged direct hostility toward protesters as seeking privilege without deserving it through work.

H3. Social or political participation. Education increases the extent of participation, which in turn decreases antagonism toward protest.

H4. Mobility. Education increases upward mobility and hence feelings of economic security with resulting decrease in antagonism toward protest.

H5. Conceptual sophistication. Education increases conceptual sophistication, which increases the likelihood that ideological issues (such as freedom of speech) will counterbalance negative aspects of protest and hence decrease antagonism to protest.

H6. Political efficacy. Education enhances the feeling of political efficacy, which in turn decreases antagonism toward protest.

PROCEDURE

Strategy of hypothesis testing. For each hypothesis, evidence is marshalled from prior reports of related research, and from a secondary analysis of data from two national surveys: a study of attitudes toward violence by Blumenthal et al. (1972), and the 1970 electoral study by the Center for Political Studies of the University of Michigan.[1] As exploratory analyses suggested that there were important differences between blacks and whites, the present analyses are limited to whites. As Blumenthal's violence study was limited to males, and sex differences are probable, the present analyses are limited to males in the voting study. Early analyses revealed some error associated with those respondents whose educational attainment is not complete. In order to limit the effects of this error in the violence study, respondents who were both under 20 years of age and still students were eliminated from the sample except for one analysis mentioned later. Similar information was not readily available in the voting study, so all respondents under 21 were eliminated from the sample. This left truncated samples of N = 1132 in the violence study and N = 580 in the voting study.

Measures of antagonism to protest. From the violence study, two 3-item Guttman scales were developed as dependent variables, one representing the degree of punitiveness or antagonism against student protesters, and the other against black protesters.[2] In the voting study, two questions selected as the dependent variables were roughly equivalent to the above antagonism scales. In each question, one end of a seven-point scale represented use of force to end the disturbance, and the other end was less repressive and more sympathetic.[3]

Measures of test variables. Several test variables were required to test the six issue-free hypotheses. The occupational prestige of the respondent's father, measured in Duncan deciles in both data sets, was used as the measure of SES of the family of origin for testing H1, the class-based socialization hypothesis. For testing H2, the hypothesis about conflict over earned privilege, the Duncan decile score of the respondent, and the respondent's family income were used. To test H3, the violence study had a participation index, based on the number of organizational memberships. In the voting study, a Guttman scale of political participation was used, based on three items about active political participation.[4] As a simple index of intergenerational mobility to test H4, the Duncan occupational prestige of the father (in deciles) was subtracted from the corresponding score of the respondent.

The test of H5 required a measure of conceptual sophistication. From the Blumenthal data, three different indices were developed to measure components of conceptual sophistication: an index of logical consistency among items, an index of use of "don't know" in response to abstract open-ended questions, and an interviewer's rating of the respondent's understanding of questions. The three were combined into a single index of "conceptual sophistication," or CS. An index of political efficacy was already present in the voting study.[5] Hence H5 and H6 can each be tested on only one dataset.

Relation of education with punitiveness. The first step in analysis was to determine whether education did correlate with antagonism to protest in these datasets. Table 1 shows the percent high in antagonism by level of education, separately for each dataset. As expected there is a general trend

toward lower antagonism at higher levels of educational attainment. In violence study, education correlated (Tau c) with antagonism to students -.26, and with antagonism to blacks -.18. In the voting study, the same correlations were, respectively, -.18 and -.07. The first three are statistically highly significant ($p < .001$), and the fourth has $p < .05$.

Table 1 about here

All four are in the predicted direction.

POSSIBLE EXTRANEOUS VARIABLES

Age might spuriously produce the observed correlation betweed education and antagonism because those who are older are less educated and more antagonistic. Table 2 reports correlations within homogeneous categories of age. Of the 12 correlations with control for age, compared to the corresponding zero-order ones, 6 are more negative, 5 more positive, and one unchanged. Age clearly is not the source of the correlations. However, age does specify the relationship in the voting study, where the correlations among respondents under age 50 are larger than the zero-order coefficients, while the correlations among respondents over 50 are small and non-significant. Three previous studies on national representative samples have shown a similar specification by age (Robinson, 1970;

Table 2 about here

Spaeth, 1969; Stouffer, 1955). Hence in tests of hypotheses in the voting study, two correlations are reported: for all respondents, and for those 49 years or younger.

Other variables that might serve as extraneous variables affecting both educational attainment and antagonism to protest include place of residence (city, suburb, small independent town, rural area), living in the south, and present status as a student. Data on each of these were available in the violence study, and conditional taus were computed with each of these as a test variable. Using the four values of place of residence mentioned above, the correlation becomes very small and non significant for respondents living in suburbs on both antagonism scales. However, the other six taus change only slightly and unsystematically--2 being more negative, 3 more positive, and one unchanged. Experience of living in the south was controlled in three levels (none, some, much) and there was no over-all attenuation nor any strong specification. Hence lower educational attainment and higher antagonism to protest in the south does not account for the observed correlations. To assess the effect of student status, taus were computed for all respondents (including students of all ages), for respondents other than young students, and for respondents other than students and fathers of students. Exclusion of students and fathers of students made little difference, which suggests that the correlations are not produced by this factor.

Hence none of the plausible extraneous variables appears to account for the observed correlations. It appears reasonable to proceed on the assumption that the correlation represents a causal link.

TESTS OF ISSUE-FREE HYPOTHESES

First, each test variable was correlated (tau b or c) with both education and antagonism; then, if those correlations were significant, the conditional correlations (tau c) between education and antagonism were computed

within levels of the test variable. Except where otherwise stated, each test variable correlated significantly ($p < .01$) with both education and antagonism.

H1. Class-based socialization. It is possible that educational attainment and attitudes toward protest are correlated because both result from socio-economic differences in the families of origin. Low SES in childhood results in less completed education and also, because of class differences in socialization (Kohn, 1969), in greater respect for authority which, in turn, causes hostility to protesters as defying authority. Hence the correlation reflects the fact that both education and attitude to protest result from an extraneous variable--SES during childhood. This interpretation is an elaboration of one suggested by Ransford (1972), who reported on the reactions to protest in a sample of white Los Angeles residents, focusing on differences among occupational levels. He found educational attainment a strong correlate of hostility to student and black protest, even with control of occupational level. One of Ransford's explanations for this result was class differences in socialization, with blue-collar families inculcating strong respect for authority and conformity. In his sample, class differences in socialization seemed to have only minor effect, but his was a local sample and the hypothesis has not been tested on a national sample.

In our secondary analysis, H1 is tested by controlling for the father's occupational status, with the results reported in Table 3. This control attenuates the correlations only slightly, so it would be difficult to argue that the hypothesis explains the observed correlations. Both Ransford's (1972) evidence and the present results indicate that H1 is not supported.

Table 3 about here

H2. Conflict over earned privilege. Ransford's (1972) second proposed explanation for the differences by occupational level was a revised class conflict model in which blue-collar workers reaffirm traditional beliefs in the work ethic and the openness of the American system and therefore direct hostility at protesters whom they see as seeking privilege without deserving it through work. The causal chain hypothesized is that education increases privilege (shown in levels of occupation and income), which decreases economic insecurity and the sense of conflict, which in turn decreases antagonism toward protesters. Ransford's controls did not produce strong evidence to support this interpretation, and results reported by Olsen (1968) and Olsen and Baden (1974) suggest that this explanation accounts for little of the observed correlation. However, there is no adequate evidence based on a national sample.

In the present secondary analysis, H2 is tested in two ways--by controls for the respondent's occupational status and his family income. Table 4 shows the effects of controlling the two indicators of privilege. Each of the 12 correlations in the violence study is attenuated, but only slightly.

Table 4 about here

In the voting study, there is no overall attenuation, but there is one striking specification of the correlation, with the sign reversed for respondents of low occupational status. The only reasonable conclusion from this analysis and from earlier evidence cited above is that H2 is not supported.

H3. Social or political participation. In their study in Indianapolis, Olsen and Baden (1974) found that the primary effect of education on attitude to protest was mediated by the intervening variable of participation and its

resulting effect on feelings of political efficacy. Stouffer, in his classic study of civil liberties (1955), found active community leaders generally more tolerant of non-conforming views than the public at large, possibly as a result of the higher level of social/political participation by the community leaders. Though there is modest support for H3 in the Indianapolis study, there is no evidence based on a national sample.

In the present secondary analysis, H3 is tested by controlling participation, as reported in Table 5. In the voting study, there is no

Table 5 about here

evidence to support the hypothesis. In the violence study there may be a little overall attenuation, but it is slight.

Evidence to support H3 is weak and unconvincing. In one local study, there appears to be a slight effect of participation. In one national study there is no effect, and in another, very slight effect. Clearly participation is not a decisive factor, though like occupational level, it may account for a small portion of the covariance.

H4. Mobility. Another possible explanation, apparently not considered in previous research on attitudes toward protest, is that education has its effect primarily through its influence upon mobility. This is related to H2, except that it posits, not position in the class structure, but movement through the class structure as the critical determinant of attitudes toward protest. According to H4, those who are upwardly mobile are more secure in their positions and less threatened by protest than those who are downwardly mobile.

However, mobility did not correlate significantly with education nor with either of the antagonism scales in either dataset. Hence this hypothesis was rejected without further test. At least with the present measure of mobility, it cannot explain the correlation of education with antagonism.

H5. Conceptual sophistication. Gamson and McEvoy (1972) offer an interpretation of the effect of education on support of police violence which may apply to attitudes toward protest generally. Education correlated with an index of support for police violence in their data so that the more educated were less supportive of police violence against protest, even when several other factors were controlled. The authors suggested that education had an effect through influencing the conceptual sophistication of the respondent (Gamson and McEvoy, 1972: 340). In other words, education increases the ability and inclination to think abstractly and the extent of cognitive differentiation, which in turn increase the likelihood that ideological issues (such as freedom of expression and rights of peaceful petition) will be given some positive weight to balance the negative aspects of protest (such as disruption and inconvenience). Stouffer's (1955) "rigid categorizers" seem very much the same as persons with low conceptual sophistication, and they tended to both low educational attainment and low tolerance.

In the present secondary analysis, H5 is tested by controlling the conceptual sophistication index (CS), as shown in Table 6. Of the six correlations with CS control, four are smaller than the zero-order correlation, and there is a consistent pattern of specification so that those of medium CS show substantial correlations, and those of high and low CS show little

---

Table 6 about here

---

or none. Hence it appears to be true that educational attainment correlates

with antagonism to protest primarily or among those of medium conceptual sophistication. It seems safe to conclude that H5 is not supported: CS does not explain the correlation between educational attainment and antagonism though it does produce an interesting specification.

H6. Political efficacy. There is some evidence in Ransford (1972) that the feeling of powerlessness is correlated with both education and hostility to protest. Olsen's results have been inconsistent on this point. Using data from the city of Ann Arbor only, Olsen (1968) found education the strongest single predictor of tolerance for protest methods both in zero-order correlations and with controls for related variables, including a political efficacy scale. Olsen and Baden (1974) replicated this study in three other U.S. settings and in one Swedish city, Gävle. In linear multiple regression analyses for two cities (Indianapolis and Gävle), age and education were the strongest zero-order predictors of tolerance for protest methods. However most of the effect of education in Indianapolis (though not in Gävle) appeared to be indirect, through increasing participation and political efficacy. The only hint of support for H6 comes from Olsen's evidence in one city--Indianapolis.

In the present secondary analyses, H6 is tested by controlling political efficacy in the voting study, as reported in Table 7. Three of the correlations

---

Table 7 about here

---

are larger and three smaller than the zero-order correlations, with non-significant correlations among those of medium efficacy and rather large ones among those of high and low efficacy.

H6 is not supported. Efficacy does not explain the correlation between education and antagonism, but efficacy does specify in the relationship.

Combination of hypothesized effects. No control of a single test variable consistently attenuated the correlations between education and antagonism very much. There remains the possibility that each accounts for a small portion of the covariance and that their additive effects account for the correlation. To get a rough test of the effects of simultaneous controls, a partial regression analysis was conducted on the data from the violence study, though this requires the added assumptions of interval measurement and linear correlation (both questionable here) and involves loss of over 30% of the cases, leaving N = 777. The zero-order Pearson correlation coefficients were: education correlated with antagonism to students, r = -.26, and with antagonism to blacks, r = -.21. Entered into the partial regression were the four hypothesized intervening variables in the violence study: respondent's occupational status, conceptual sophistication, income, and participation. The fourth-order partial r of education with antagonism to students was -.16, and with antagonism to blacks, -.14. Squaring each r to determine variance accounted for, it appears that the four controls combined account for between half and two-thirds of the covariance, if one accepts the results based on a severely reduced sample and linear correlations.

ISSUE-BOUND HYPOTHESES

Advocates of an issue-bound interpretation might argue that most people react to the underlying issues of the specific protest, not to either the immediate disruptive effects nor to abstractions such as free expression. Hence the observed correlation between educational attainment and antagonism to student and black protesters simply reflects the fact that the particular

protest causes of the 1960's were ones supported primarily by educated people. If this is true, one would expect controls for issue-related attitudes to attenuate the correlation between education and antagonism.

There is some evidence against this position. Spaeth (1969) found that the correlation between educational attainment and support for student protest was replicated with control for political leanings (liberal vs. conservative). Robinson (1970) found attitude toward the Chicago protest more strongly correlated with education than with party identification, attitude toward Vietnam policies, or candidate preference. Olsen (1968, 1974) used as his dependent variable a scale referring to support of various methods of protest for any group that strongly feels unfairly treated, and education was a strong correlate of this scale, even with related controls.

Still it is possible that issue-related attitudes may account for part of the relationship. Only minor evidence could be drawn from secondary analysis of of the violence study. In that study respondents were asked if they agreed with blacks that some social change was needed to meet the needs of blacks. A similar question was asked about students. The great majority (over 90%) answered yes to these questions. Controlling for these answers did not attenuate the correlations between education and antagonism. Blumenthal (1972) also had a reverse discrimination index, based on several open-ended questions, and about one sixth of respondents were "reverse discrimination whites", by this index. Control for this measure did not attenuate the correlation between education and antagonism to blacks, though there was apparent specification, with a non-significant tau of -.05 for the reverse discrimination whites and -.19 for the others. These bits of evidence, like bits from earlier studies, fail to support an issue-bound interpretation.

DISCUSSION

It is not possible to account for the correlation between educational attainment and antagonism toward collective violence by the extraneous variables tested. Class-based socialization has been ruled out by controls for father's occupational status. No evidence was found that student status, place of residence, or experience living in the South accounted for the observed correlations. Age has been ruled out by controls in the present datasets and also in Robinson (1970), Olsen, (1968), Olsen and Baden (1974), and Spaeth (1969). Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that the correlation between educational attainment and antagonism toward protest does represent a causal link, and to seek to identify the intervening steps in the causal chain.

Five issue-free causal explanations (H2 through H6) of the link between educational attainment and antagonism to protest were proposed. Each failed to account for the observed correlation. Combining four of the hypothesized intervening variables yielded results suggesting that, in combination, they might account for over half of the relationship.

Two general lines of further inquiry now appear to be the most promising. One of the these would explore more systematically the issue-bound interpretations which focus on the particular issues underlying instances of collective violence or protest. The other would develop a more complex issue-free model that fits the quirks of the present data and then test it on new data.

The possibility of an issue-bound interpretation remains because the range of particular issues and actors used in research to date is narrow, and in efforts at obtaining issue-free results by asking questions that mention neither actors nor issues (Olsen, 1968; Olsen and Baden, 1974)

respondents may have projected into their answers those groups whose protest was salient at the time. Hence one useful line of research would extend the domain of the research to date by considering public attitudes toward quite different instances, such as truckdrivers protest against fuel policy and protest against bussing for school integration.[6] There is also another plausible issue-free explanation that might account for much of the correlation and for some of the specifications of the correlation discovered in the present data. The link between education and attitude to protest may be the selective interaction that occurs during and as a subsequent result of the educational process. As in Newcomb's (1943) classic Bennington study, college attenders may be influenced by peers and professors to become more tolerant, and they may later be more likely to attain jobs and join organizations where most people are relatively tolerant. Hence those with high educational attainment spend more time, on the average, with persons who are tolerant of such things as collective violence and protest. The higher the educational attainment, the greater the exposure to tolerant social contexts.

This mechanism might also account for the observation that age specifies the correlation between education and attitude. If a tolerant attitude was induced by the tolerant social setting of an educational institution, and if not all graduates gravitate into supportive social contexts (almost certainly true), then the effect of the educational setting would weaken, on the average, with passing time, yielding the observed specification of the correlation.

It is also possible, though it would require additional assumptions, that the same line of theoretical reasoning could account for the ways in which CS and efficacy specify the correlation. Suppose that we conceive the

attitude in question as determined by some mixture of (a) stable personality characteristics determined in early socialization, and (b) the prevailing attitude in the current social context. Suppose also that certain cognitive characteristics, such as CS and efficacy, affect the relative weights of those two determinants and the degree of tolerance found in the current social context. Together these plausible assumptions could account for the complex specifications found in the correlations of education with antagonism though further research is needed to test this idea.

FOOTNOTES

*We gratefully acknowledge computer services for this research provided by the Computer Center of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. We are also grateful for critical comments on earlier drafts by Mildred Schwartz, Richard Videbeck, and Richard Warnecke.

1 Data for both studies were made available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. The authors accept full responsibility for data analyses and interpretations.

2 The items and their scoring were as follows :

Antagonism to students: "When you think about student disturbances on campuses and elsewhere, which involve a lot of property damage, how do you think police should handle the situation?"

	Answer scored on the scale:
"The police should let it go, not do anything."	Never, or hardly ever
"The police should shoot, but not to kill."	Sometimes, or almost always
"The police should shoot to kill."	Sometimes, or almost always

Antagonism to blacks: When you think about big city riots (ghetto disturbances/ inner-city disturbances) involving Negroes (Black people/colored people) and police, how do you think the police should handle the situation?" (Items and answer scoring identical to the scale above.) The coefficients of reproducibility and scalability were, respectively, .94 and .79 for antagonism to students and .93 and .74 for antagonism to blacks.

3 The exact items may be found as variables 85 and 99 in the codebook of CPS study 49517, or may be obtained by writing to the authors.

4 "Yes" in response to each of the following three items was scored in the scale: "During the campaign did you talk to anybody and try to show them why they should vote for one of the parties or candidates?" "Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, dinners, or things like that?" "Did you do any other work for one of the parties or candidates?" The coefficients of reproducibility and scalability were .96 and .74, respectively, on the entire sample of 1,580 respondents.

5 The index was based on the following 4 items, with the highest efficacy score for disagreeing with all items: "People like me don't have any say about what the government does." "Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things." "Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on." "I don't think public officials care much about what people like me think."

6 Such a test is under way and will be reported in a separate paper.

REFERENCES

Blumenthal, Monica D. et al.

1972 Justifying Violence: Attitudes of American Men. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Gamson, William A. and James McEvoy

1972 "Police Violence and Its Public Support." Pp. 329-342 in James F. Short and M. Wolfgang, eds., Collective Violence. Chicago and New York: Aldine-Atherton.

Kohn, Melvin

1969 Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Newcomb, T.M.

1943 Personality and Social Change. New York: Dryden.

Olsen, Marvin E.

1968 "Perceived Legitimacy of Social Protest Actions." Social Problems 15 (Winter): 297-310.

Olsen, Marvin E. and Mary A. Baden

1974 "Legitimacy of Social Protest Actions in the United States and Sweden." Journal of Political and Military Sociology 2 (Fall): 173-189.

Ransford, H. Edward

1972 "Blue Collar Anger: Reactions to Student and Black Protest." American Sociological Review 37 (June): 333-346.

Robinson, John P.

1970 "Public Reaction to Political Protest: Chicago 1968." Public Opinion Quarterly 34 (Spring): 1-9.

Spaeth, Joe L.

1969 "Public Reactions to College Student Protests." Sociology of Education 42 (Spring): 199-206.

Stouffer, Samuel A.

1955 Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York: Doubleday.

ASA 1977

Hall and Rosenthal, Education and Antagonism to Protest

Six issue-free hypotheses to account for the observed correlations between educational attainment and antagonism toward protest and protesters:

H1. Class-based socilization. Educational attainment and attitude toward protest are results of common cause: social class differences in socialization. Hence their correlation is spurious and not evidence of a causal link.

H2. Conflict over earned privilege. Education increases privilege (as shown in income and occupational level), and the less privileged direct hostility at protesters as seeking privilege without deserving it through work.

H3. Social or political participation. Education increases the extent of participation, which in turn decreases antagonism toward protest.

H4. Mobility. Education increases upward mobility and hence feelings of economic security with resulting decrease in antagonism toward protest.

H5. Conceptual Sophistication. Education increases conceptual sophistication, which increases the likelihood that ideological issues (such as freedom of speech) will counterbalance negative aspects of protest, and hence decrease antagonism to protest.

H6. Political Efficacy. Education enhances the feeling of political efficacy, which in turn decreases antagonism toward protest.

Hall and Rosenthal, Education and Antagonism to Protest

TABLE 1. PERCENT HIGH IN ANTAGONISM, BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT*
(N IN PARENTHESES)

		No H.S.	Some H.S.	H.S. Grad.	Some College	College Grad.	Over-all
Violence Study	Antagonism to Students	65.5	60.8	52.1	41.4	31.1	51.0
		(255)	(120)	(378)	(177)	(183)	(1113)
	Antagonism to Blacks	74.0	73.8	62.2	57.9	50.8	63.6
		(254)	(122)	(378)	(175)	(183)	(1112)
Voting Study	Antagonism to Students	64.2	51.9	51.0	46.4	29.8	49.8
		(134)	(79)	(104)	(153)	(84)	(554)
	Antagonism to Blacks	44.9	42.0	46.6	40.5	33.3	41.9
		(138)	(88)	(103)	(153)	(84)	(566)

*The measures of antagonism differ between the two studies. See text.

TABLE 2. CORRELATION (TAU C) OF EDUCATION WITH ANTAGONISM, CONTROLLING AGE

		Violence Study	Voting Study
Education with Antagonism to Students	1. Zero-order	-.26	-.18
	2. Age 50-64	-.29	-.08[n]
	3. Age 30-49	-.19	-.25
	4. Age 29 or less	-.26	-.22
Education with Antagonism to Blacks	5. Zero-order	-.18	-.07*
	6. Age 50-64	-.22	-.02[n]
	7. Age 30-49	-.16	-.14*
	8. Age 29 or less	-.16	-.19*

[n] Not significant ($p > .05$)

* $.01 < p < .05$

All others have $p < .01$

TABLE 3. TESTS OF H1: CORRELATIONS (TAU C) OF EDUCATION WITH ANTAGONISM, CONTROLLING FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

		Violence Study	Voting Study All ages	Voting Study Age under 50
Education with Antagonism to Students	1. Zero-order	-.26	-.18	-.26
	2. Father's status high	-.26	-.16*	-.21
	3. Father's status medium	-.09n	-.12	-.21
	4. Father's status low	-.23	-.11n	-.08n
Education with Antagonism to Blacks	5. Zero-order	-.18	-.07*	-.18
	6. Father's status high	-.17*	-.10n	-.16*
	7. Father's status medium	-.13	-.04n	-.13
	8. Father's status low	-.13	-.07n	-.21n

n Not significant ($p > .05$)
* $.01 < p < .05$
All others are significant ($p < .01$)

TABLE 4. TESTS OF H2: CORRELATIONS (TAU C) OF EDUCATION WITH ANTAGONISM, CONTROLLING R'S OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, FAMILY INCOME

		Violence Study	Voting Study	
			All white males	Age under 50
Education with Antagonism to Students				
1.	Zero-order	-.26	-.18	-.26
2.	R's status high	-.19	-.19	-.23
3.	R's status medium	-.10*	-.19	-.26
4.	R's status low	-.20	.05[n]	.08[n]
5.	Income $12,000 +	-.15	-.21	-.27
6.	Income $8,000-$11,999	-.22	-.18	-.26
7.	Income under $8000	-.25	-.19	-.45
Education with Antagonism to Blacks				
8.	Zero-order	-.18	-.07*	-.18
9.	R's status high	-.11*	-.06[n]	-.15*
10.	R's status medium	-.17*	-.07[n]	-.13*
11.	R's status low	-.12	.23	.25
12.	Income $12,000 +	-.12*	-.09*	-.15
13.	Income $8,000 - $11,999	-.15	.03[n]	-.15
14.	Income under $8,000	-.16	-.17*	-.28

[n] Not significant ($p > .05$)
* $.01 < p < .05$
All others are significant ($p < .01$)

Hall and Rosenthal, Education and Antagonism to Protest

TABLE 5. TESTS OF H3: CORRELATIONS (TAU C) OF EDUCATION WITH ANTAGONISM, CONTROLLING PARTICIPATION

		Violence Study	Voting Study	
			All white males	Age under 50
Education with Antagonism to Students				
1.	Zero-order	-.26	-.18	-.26
2.	High participation	-.16	-.22	-.36
3.	Medium participation	-.27		
4.	Low participation	-.24	-.15	-.17
Education with Antagonism to Blacks				
5.	Zero-order	-.18	-.07*	-.18
6.	High participation	-.14	-.11*	-.21
7.	Medium participation	-.12		
8.	Low participation	-.17	-.04n	-.12*

[n] Not significant ($p > .05$)

* $.01 < p < .05$

All others are significant ($p < .01$)

TABLE 6. TESTS OF H5: CORRELATIONS (TAU C) OF EDUCATION WITH ANTAGONISM, CONTROLLING CONCEPTUAL SOHISTICATION (VIOLENCE STUDY ONLY)

	Education with:	
	Antagonism to Students	Antagonism to Blacks
1. Zero-order	-.26	-.18
2. High CS	-.16	-.09[n]
3. Medium CS	-.31	-.30
4. Low CS	-.13	.00[n]

[n]Not significant ($p > .05$)

*$.01 < p < .05$

All others are significant ($p < .01$)

TABLE 7. TESTS OF H6: CORRELATIONS (TAU C) OF EDUCATION WITH ANTAGONISM, CONTROLLING POLITICAL EFFICACY (VOTING STUDY ONLY)

	Education with Antagonism to Students		Education with Antagonism to Blacks	
	All ages	Age under 50	All ages	Age under 50
1. Zero-order	-.18	-.26	-.07*	-.18
2. High efficacy	-.24	-.27	-.06[n]	-.13[n]
3. Medium efficacy	.00[n]	-.06[n]	.06[n]	-.05[n]
4. Low efficacy	-.23	-.36	-.15	-.27

[n] Not significant ($p > .05$)

* $.01 < p < .05$

All others are significant ($p < .01$)